1: Pelzer S-5 (1940-1941) 1945 AL1 Southeast Asia AL1

Chapter I

FROM HUNTING AND GATHERING TO AGRICULTURE

Hunting and Gathering

In Southeastern Asia today there are peoples of different cultural levels carrying on some of the major economies that man has developed in the course of time. The first people to invade the tropical forest regions around the South China Sea were alithic, or prepalaeolithic, food gatherers,[1] who obtained their food by collecting edible wild plants and by hunting and fishing. Today geographically separated peoples are still living in a prepalaeolithic or palaeolithic food-gathering and hunting stage.[2] In Southeastern Asia they are represented by the Semang of the Malay Peninsula, the Andaman Islanders, and the Aeta of the Philippines—all of whom are Negritos, or dwarfed Negroids—the Kubu of Sumatra, the Sakai of the Malay Peninsula, the Toala of Celebes,[3] and the Punan of Borneo.[4]

The degree to which collecting, hunting, or fishing contributes to the food supply varies with the season; it also varies with different peoples, depending upon the resources of the region, the type of equipment the people may possess, and the skills they may have acquired. Food-gathering and hunting peoples have a division of labor under which the men hunt while the women and children gather vegetable matter and catch insects and small animals. The men may lend a helping hand, however, in digging up some of the very deep-growing yams. Men will also participate in the picking of fruits, especially when it is necessary to climb tall trees. The food gatherers and hunters of Southeastern Asia are nomadic in the sense that they do not remain long in one place. However, they do not wander aimlessly through the jungle. Each group has its definite territory—among

---

Note: The titles of the works here cited in footnotes have been abbreviated, whenever possible. The full titles may be found in the Bibliography, p. 269 ff.

[1] Nippold (Rassen- und Kulturgeschichte der Negrito-Völker, 1936, pp. 253–255 and 398–400) considers the alithic wood culture of the Negritos of Southeastern Asia to be older than palaeolithic culture. These people use wood rather than stone as raw material for their tools. Because of the perishable nature of wood, archaeologists and prehistorians have not yet been able, so far as I know, to go farther back than the palaeolithic age and therefore have not been able to confirm the hypothesis of an alithic age. Menghin (Weltgeschichte der Steinzeit, 1931, p. 91) believes that, from an archaeological point of view, an alithic wood culture may be regarded only as a possibility, but Kern (Die Anfänge der Weltgeschichte, 1933, p. 35), who compared pygmy culture with palaeolithic cultures, comes to the conclusion that alithic wood cultures probably preceded palaeolithic culture.

[2] By divesting the word "palaeolithic" of its specific chronological connotation the term may be used for present-day peoples who have a food-gathering and hunting culture.

[3] The racial affinities of the Kubu, the Sakai, and the Toala are not clear; by some they are called Veddoids, by others, Australoids.

[4] They are considered to be Proto-Malays.

1: Pelzer S-5 (1940-1941) 1945 AL1 Southeast Asia AL4

222 [114] 241 462

During untold centuries in which they collected plant matter, women acquired an intimate knowledge of vegetable life. Eduard Hahn and others have therefore reasoned that women were the inventors of the cultivation of plants and hence were the first food producers. Hahn has given the name *Hackbau* (hoe culture or hoe tillage) to primitive cultivation, and maintains that the hoe is woman's implement; he draws a sharp distinction between Hackbau and more advanced cultivation, which he calls *Pflugbau* (plow culture or plow tillage) and ascribes to men.[9] It is indeed true that men generally farm with plows and that many examples may be cited of women using hoes; nevertheless, there are so many instances of male primitive cultivators employing hoes or similar instruments that Hahn's classification should be modified. While there seems to be no reason for abandoning his theory of the invention of plant cultivation by women, the classification of cultivation by tools, such as the hoe and the plow, ascribed to one sex or the other, is unsatisfactory. For, in spite of the fact that the collection of vegetable matter is almost exclusively the woman's task in the gathering economy, among primitive cultivators men either assist women in the cultivation of plants or entirely take over this activity whenever hunting or fishing become less important than soil tillage. Furthermore, many primitive cultivators do not use the hoe, but continue to employ the digging stick, characteristically used by the food-gathering women. From Formosa southward throughout the Malay Archipelago, as well as on the mainland of Southeastern Asia, the digging stick, also known as the dibble stick or planting stick, is frequently used by the primitive cultivator. On the other hand, there are advanced cultivators who till their land intensively with hoes; they use manure, rotate their crops, terrace fields that lie on slopes, and practice irrigation, yet they do not use plows drawn by draft animals (however, in some instances they have livestock). In other words, advanced agriculture does not depend upon the animal-drawn plow nor does primitive agriculture depend upon the hoe.

[101] [105]

A more fundamental distinction between primitive and advanced agriculture may be made in terms of land use rather than of tools. Primitive cultivators, with the possible exception of those living in arid regions, raise one or two crops on a given plot of land, then abandon the plot and make a new field, preferably in the forest, so that the old plot lies fallow sometimes for many years and may itself revert to forest; in short, primitive cultivators shift the place of their agricultural activities with regularity. The crop land consists of small patches scattered throughout the forest; these patches are extremely ragged in appearance and do not look at all like fields. A primitive cultivator would never think of removing stumps and fallen trees; instead, he deliberately raises his crop among them. This kind of cultivation is best described as shifting-field, or shift-

241 311

[9] Hahn: Das Alter der wirtschaftlichen Kultur, 1905; idem: Die Entstehung der Pflugkultur, 1909; idem: Von der Hacke zum Pflug, 1914; Kolff: "Hahn's hypothese," 1926, pp. 884–907.

1: Pelzer S-5 (1940-1941) 1945 AL1 Southeast Asia AL1
[Filed in category 253.-- Analyst]
[see p. 11, category 116.-- Analyst]

243

suffer a certain amount of damage. The seedlings must therefore be given time to grow strong enough to endure the temporary uprooting. They usually need from 30 to 40 days before they are ready for transplanting. Whenever early transplanting is necessary a technique is employed which is known in the Philippines as *dapog*. The puddled seedbed is completely covered with banana leaves, which are pressed slightly into the mud so that a thin layer of mud spreads over the leaves. On top of this is placed a layer, an inch thick, of rice hulls or finely cut straw. The whole is thoroughly soaked and sown with seeds. The banana leaves prevent the roots of the seedlings from growing into the ground and suffering the usual damage when transplanted, but the seedlings must be transplanted within two weeks after the sowing of the seed.

In the riparian marshes of Sumatra and Borneo—the *lebak* areas—all the land is flooded at the time when the rice seed should be put into the ground. The inhabitants of these districts, however, have found an ingenious solution to their problem: the floating seedbed. They build small rafts of bamboo, reed, banana stems, or the leaf-ribs of the sago palm, on which they place a layer of rush, or some other aquatic plant, and then a thick layer of fine mud. As the water level rises and falls the seedlings have a chance to develop on the float unharmed.

Numerous also are the techniques employed to supply wet-rice fields with the necessary water (see pp. 47–51). These reflect the nature of the terrain, the social organization, and the stage of technical development of the inhabitants. For it is obvious that the cultivation of wet rice on the plains of the Red River in Tongking would require very different techniques from those required on the steep mountain slopes of northern Luzon.

Culture, Types of Land Use, and Population Pressure

101 161 361

One of the most striking characteristics of Southeastern Asia is the great variation in the density of the population (Map, Fig. 1B). This variation reflects differences in culture as well as differences in physical environment. The culture and social organization of a people are intimately linked to their technique and the intensity of their land use, which in turn guide the people in their selection of new land when it becomes necessary for them to seek new homes. The Cambodians, for example, when living in an environment similar to that of the Annamese, do not create the large rural settlements characteristic of areas inhabited by the latter.[28] Likewise, the Madurese prefer to settle in small hamlets or in isolated homesteads (*Einzelhof*) and to till unirrigated land, whereas the Javanese live in large villages and are by preference wet-field cultivators. Again, while the Bontocs and Ifugaos of northern Luzon build terraces and cultivate wet rice as their primary crop, the neighboring Apayaos, most of the Kalingas, the Tinggians, and the Gaddangs have so far resisted all attempts on the

000

[28] Gourou: L'utilisation du sol, 1940, p. 94.

1: Peizer S-5 (1940-1941) 1945 AL1 Southeast Asia HL-1

lanzones, papayas, and chicos, which find a good market in Manila, but on the whole we rarely meet in the Philippines such intensive garden culture as in Java. The diet of the average Filipino is not well balanced and is particularly deficient in fruits and vegetables. In recognition of this fact the Bureau of Education and the Bureau of Plant Industry have both done much to impress the peasants with the need for fruit and vegetable gardens. Although the situation has improved during the past forty years and a large variety of fruits is now produced, the country still depends upon imports, whereas with a little effort most of the imported fruits could be produced locally and would furnish an additional source of income. It would be well to encourage the peasants to grow more fruits and to advise them on the most suitable varieties. In the other countries of Southeastern Asia, also, with the possible exception of Java, such advice would be valuable.

The published material available on the importance of gardens in Indochina is similarly limited in quantity. Even Gourou in his study of land utilization restricts himself chiefly to listing the fruits and vegetables found in the gardens and to stating that certain districts are renowned for the quality of their garden fruits. Gourou's list of fruits and vegetables is as varied and extensive, however, as similar lists for any of the other countries of Southeastern Asia.

Wet Fields

Throughout the countries bordering the South China Sea most of the cultivated land is used for the growing of lowland, or wet, rice. For this purpose the fields must be leveled and surrounded by earth dams to impound rain water during the rainy season or to confine the water that is carried to the fields through irrigation canals or lifted to the fields by mechanical means. If a field is properly leveled the surrounding dyke will keep the water everywhere at the same depth. The size of the wet-rice, or paddy, fields, and the amount of labor that is required to make them, depend upon the topography of the region. In the lowlands, where no terracing is required, there is relatively little labor involved in the making of paddies, which are frequently large. A hilly, or mountainous, terrain necessitates terracing, which demands greater effort and reduces the size of individual fields; the steeper the slope, the narrower the paddies. We have only to see the rice terraces of the mountains of northern Luzon, southern Bali, the Preanger districts of West Java, or Sumatra's West Coast in order to realize how much effort has been expended in building these terraces and how much energy must be devoted to their upkeep. The terraces, as well as the wet-rice fields of the plains, represent the accumulated efforts of generations of peasants, each of which has helped to extend the area devoted to the cultivation of wet rice (Figs. 50–58).

Not all people show the same skill in the making of paddies. According to Credner, the Thai are quite helpless on sloping land that requires terracing before wet rice may be planted. They would prefer to migrate to a

[See pp. 115 ff. category 116. -- Analyst]

2:Purcell G-4 (no date) 1951 AL1 Southeast Asia AL1
Chinese

A NOTE ON NOMENCLATURE AND SPELLING

THE nomenclature of areas, countries, towns, peoples, &c., is constantly changing to meet the requirements of politics or the caprice of fashion. The word 'Indonesia' seems to have been used for the first time in 1850 by J. R. Logan to describe the Malay Archipelago, and in recent years it has been appropriated by both the Indonesian nationalists and the Dutch to describe what, before the Second World War, had variously been known in English-language books and journals as the Dutch East Indies, Netherlands India, and the Netherlands Indies.[1] Siam in 1939 changed its name to Thailand; in 1945 it changed it again to Siam, and in May 1949 back to Thailand once more. Since in this work the period covered is mostly the time when Siam was officially correct as the name of the country, 'Siam' and 'Siamese' have been retained throughout. 'Malaya' was coined well over a century ago but has come into general use only in the present century. The name 'Straits Settlements' is obsolete; the 'Malayan Union' lasted for less than two years: 'Insulinde', once a popular literary name for present-day Indonesia, is almost forgotten.

National, racial, or regional feeling influences usage greatly. At one time the principal people of the Madras Presidency were known generally as 'Klings' (from the ancient kingdom of Kalinga), but objection by this people to the name because of its modern associations led to its replacement by 'Tamils'; later still the preferred name was 'South Indians'. 'Asiatic', for so long universal, is now disliked in Asia and 'Asian' is taking its place.

Southeast Asia is in many ways an unsatisfactory term. It is cumbersome, inaccurate, and indefinite in its scope. 'It is hardly (says the Secretary of the Permanent Committee on Geographical Names) a geographical name.' Yet the region is becoming more and more a political and economic entity and a name is badly needed to describe Burma, Siam, Indochina, Malaya,

[1] Nederlandsch Indië was the Dutch official name. Amry Vandenbosch, *The Dutch East Indies* (1944) p. 1, says, 'About seventy-five years ago, a German ethnologist by the name of Bastian applied the term "Indonesia" (realm of the Indian Islands) to all the islands of the region, including the Philippine Islands, Formosa, British Malaya, and Madagascar, as well as the Dutch East Indies.' But J. R. Logan, in his article 'The Ethnology of Indonesia,' in the *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, vol. iv (1850) p. 343, says: 'The Indian Archipelago must remain, but the shorter form Indonesia may be usefully employed on several occasions.' The *Oxford English Dictionary*'s first reference to 'Indonesian' is from *Nature* (1881). A. Bastian's use of the term is in the form, *Indonesien oder die Inseln des Malayschen Archipel* (Berlin, 1884), and he almost certainly got the term from Logan, or Logan's copiers. An article (in Chinese), 'Explanation of the Term "Indonesia" ', by Lin Hui-hsiang, *Journal of the South Seas Society*, vol. iv, pt. i (March 1947) p. 18, ascribes the original use of the word to Logan, and it was, indeed, this article which prompted me to the investigations here summarized.

2:Purcell G-4 (no date) 1951 AL1 Southeast Asia AL1
Chinese

101 103 British Borneo, Indonesia, and the Philippines collectively. Will the inventors of names turn their minds to it? For my part, I offer for consideration the name INDOSINESIA.

Spelling is often more fluid even than place-names. It has varied astonishingly in European works in the last century. (Who, for example, would recognize Kabaw (the valley near the Chindwin river bordering on Manipur) as Kubo, or Mengoon as Ming'un?)

Wishing as far as possible to follow authority in nomenclature and spelling, I ascertained the general policy of the Permanent Committee on Geographical Names. This committee accepts the official forms of all foreign names which are written in the Roman alphabet, but with all the diacritical marks in use in the foreign alphabets. (This last usage I have not attempted to adopt.) Names officially written in other alphabets are transliterated according to established tables. Any names officially written in non-alphabetical script are transcribed by the committee according to established systems.

As regards transliteration and transcription there is, apparently, a large measure of Anglo-American agreement. During the last two hundred years a conventional Roman alphabet has developed until now, under the name of the R.G.S. II alphabet, it is used by the Permanent Committee on Geographical Names, the United States Board on Geographical Names, the Canadian Board on Geographical Names, and the corresponding New Zealand Board. During the war the British and American staffs agreed to use the modernized Hepburn system (Romaji) for Japanese, the modified Wade system (later Giles (H.A.) as modified by Lionel Giles), and the General System of the Siamese Royal Institute. The Permanent Committee issues a number of publications giving guidance in the matter. Generally speaking (the secretary of the committee states), we should be safe in accepting the official map of a foreign country provided that we know that it is accepted in most of the country's departments of government, and provided that the latest edition is available to us. This is the procedure I have endeavoured as far as possible to follow, but I have made some exceptions in deference to common usage.

So far so good, but there remain many problems still to be solved. There is, for example, no international, or even national, agreement on the spelling of 'Southeast Asia'. In this name Southeast is variously written South East, South-East, Southeast, South-east, and even southeast or south-east. The British Admiralty continues to use the hyphen and has issued sailing directions for 'South-East Alaska' and for the 'North-East Coast of Siberia'. SEAC, on the other hand, referred to itself as the 'South East Asia Command'. American usage favours Southeast Asia and this form, pending international agreement on the subject, I have decided to adopt throughout. I have also, following contemporary French diplomatic usage, adopted 'Indochina' (Indo-China should be reserved for the whole peninsula) and also (with less certain authority) 'Cochinchina' and 'Vietnam'. But in the last case I have omitted both the circumflex and the hyphen used by Viêt-Nam.

A special difficulty arising in the course of this work has been that many

2:Purcell G-4 (no date) 1951 AL1 Southeast Asia AL1
Chinese

of the authorities quoted or followed use obsolete forms of place or personal names (e.g. Sooloo for Sulu; Theebaw for Thibaw). I have usually (but not invariably) retained the spelling of the original in quotations and often, in order not to lose contemporary colour, in the ordinary text, but where necessary the modern form has been inserted in brackets.

In the romanization of Chinese names (other than place-names in China) I have allowed myself some latitude. For example, I have dispensed with the circumflex in Chêng Ho, though I have kept the sign over the 'u' in citing the *Tsŭ Erh Chih* of Sir Francis Wade. I have also used diacritical marks in certain Vietnamese proper names. The personal names of Chinese have been hyphenated as a general rule (e.g. Chiang Kai-shek); but if I have lapsed occasionally into Tan Kah Kee, &c., it is because I have seen it spelt thus for a whole generation. Moreover, many Chinese prefer to romanize their names in their own way. I have, in fact, followed diplomacy and convenience rather than consistency. In the case of romanization of Chinese dialect forms I have relied mainly on my own knowledge.

The names of Siamese persons offer a special difficulty. Luang Pradist and Pibul Songkram have half a dozen romanized forms as well as alternative names which conceal their identity from the ordinary European reader. (I have endeavoured to ascertain official Siamese usage, but there has been inconsistency in the replies.)

Throughout I have endeavoured to follow the rule of universal good manners—to call a country or a person what they prefer to call themselves. Because of ever-changing usage this is not always easy. Moreover, national, racial, or regional sensitiveness is such that to defer to it one would often have to sacrifice accuracy. For example, it has been suggested to me that I should eliminate the word 'China' in such combinations as 'Kapitan China' for the reason that it is obnoxious to the Chinese, especially in Indonesia, where the Japanese during the occupation represented it by Sino-Japanese characters of derogatory meaning. But in this instance I could not sacrifice historical fact to contemporary resentment.

The long and the short of it is that after a manful attempt to be logical and consistent I have given up the struggle. Having made a ruling, I found myself reversing it half-way through, and sometimes being reconverted to my original position later on in the book! The result is that the survey is bristling with inconsistencies. In my disgust I feel very much as T. E. Lawrence did when in the preface to *Seven Pillars* he wrote, 'I spell my names anyhow, to show what rot the systems are'.

S: Dobby K-4 (no date) 1950 ALI Southeast Asia ALI

Chapter One

THE NATURAL LANDSCAPE OF SOUTHEAST ASIA

101 131 103 SOUTHEAST ASIA is a term which became popular during the Far Eastern War 1941-45, to describe those territories of Eastern Asia which lie south of the Tropic of Cancer (Burma, Siam, Indochina and Malaya) and the nearby islands spreading eastwards from the Asiatic continent towards New Guinea. The archipelago section merges eastwards into island groups of the West-Central Pacific, for which reason New Guinea itself may best be considered outside the definition "Southeast Asia," an exclusion justified (*a*) by its closer physical association with the Australian Continent, (*b*) by its sparse population of distinctive anthropological type now found principally in Australia, and (*c*) by the close affinities of its flora and fauna with those of Australia. The northern limit of Southeast Asia extends beyond the Tropic of Cancer to include Upper Burma on the western side, and withdraws south of the tropic to the political boundaries of Siam and Indochina farther east. By this definition, "Southeast Asia" and its off-lying islands sprawl asymmetrically across the Equator and cover a zone not far short of 1,500 miles in radius from a point off the mouth of the Mekong, an area comparable to all Europe and its seas north of the African coast. Thus isolation by great distances, as well as by physical obstructions, is a constant factor in the geographical relation between the various parts of Southeast Asia.

133 In Southeast Asia, that which forms its core and constitutes the geological link between its chief parts is the Sunda Platform, the southernmost continental block of Asia, whose integrity as a land mass has continued, with only minor tectonic disturbances on its fringes, through such long geological periods that it may be compared with those other "permanent" massifs, the Deccan, the Arabian Block and the Laurentian Shield. It is this physical feature which underlies Borneo, Eastern Sumatra, Northern Java and Malaya.

A somewhat similar platform is the common physiographic basis of Australia and New Guinea, forming what is known as the Sahul Shelf, to the east of the East Indian Archipelago.

5: Dobby K-4 (no date) 1950 ALl Southeast Asia ALl

Chapter Twenty-five

PEOPLES, POLITICS AND PROSPECTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

THE setting of Southeast Asia may be summed up as one of extremes of relief (deltaic plains and mountains) and a climate mostly approaching the wet limit for plant life but merging into monsoonal types. To this setting the people have made varying responses, ranging from migrant food gatherers and hunters in the jungles, to subsistence farmers in the plains, but all turning upon woody materials for weapons, implements, house-structures and domestic utensils, upon rice, the cereal of the wet extreme, and upon social systems of communal help. The whole social and economic life has been galvanised over the past century or two by being more and more drawn into commercial and industrial activities developed in response to and on the basis of external needs for the minerals and agricultural products of Southeast Asia, whereas prior to that time the region was touched only by a trickle of traders moving between India and China.

FACTORS IN THE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY

Several factors account for the difficulty of obtaining firm data to fill in our general picture of the historical geography of Southeast Asia. In the first place, there grew up no strong literary tradition to last through the centuries and record the past in a form other than mythical. Here tradition is largely oral and literature essentially Indian rather than indigenous. And whatever there was of local record and history has rotted away quickly, the climate, the ants, insects and moulds soon destroying anything on wood, paper, leather or cloth. Moreover, in this setting of swamps and forest, the most easily available material is wood, and artistic tradition expressed in wood, whether in carvings, buildings or tools, rapidly disintegrates, leaving little of that sort of evidence which is the basis of our facts about early periods in other regions. Buildings and carvings on stone were not normal expressions of Southeast Asia people where over large areas stone is not easily come by and where

6: Fisher U-3 (no date) 1953 All Southeast Asia All

● 101 DURING the past decade the term "South-East Asia" has figured increasingly in the literature of international affairs but there is still a surprising lack of agreement over its exact meaning. Many writers apparently continue to use it as a synonym for the whole vast area stretching from Pakistan in the West to Manchuria and Japan in the north-east, which S. K. Datta once called 'Asiatic Asia' and geographers have more usually referred to as Monsoon Asia. The very existence of these alternatives is, however, an argument against using the term South-East Asia in this way and, in the writer's opinion, there are very strong grounds for restricting its meaning to cover simply the area lying to the east of India/Pakistan and to the south of China, i.e., Burma, Thailand, Indo-China, Malaya, British Borneo, Indonesia and the Philippines. For, clearly, this area, and this alone, seems entitled on purely geographical grounds to be regarded as South-East in relation to the rest of the continent and, more important, there is an obvious need for a collective term to embrace these seven lands which have so much in common with each other.

Lying as it does between the Indian sub-continent (South Asia) and the Sino-Japanese realm (East Asia) which together constitute the two great cultural and demographic foci of the continent as a whole, South-East Asia has always been in some degree overshadowed by these neighbours. In a sense, indeed, that very fact lends it a measure of unity, for its civilizations are essentially derivative and, indeed, colonial in origin, and the region as a whole may not unfairly be regarded as transitional, both in its physical and human characteristics, between India and China. If, ethnically, its peoples are in general more closely related to the Chinese, Indian strains are nevertheless present, while, conversely, except in Annam, the Chinese element in South-East Asian culture is far less evident than the Indian, though both are usually recognizable.

[p. 12(B)]

101 Perhaps the outstanding feature of the human geography of South-East Asia throughout historic times has been the much lower density of population which it has supported, in comparison with the two neighbouring subcontinents already noted. In the main this must be attributed to the great difficulty of entry overland, through the mass of lofty jungle-covered plateau in the north, to the predominantly mountainous character of South-East Asia itself, and to the prevalence of tropical diseases which are endemic in such conditions. So far as available records can be trusted, the population of South-East Asia has never exceeded a third of that of either the Indian subcontinent or China proper, and today its average density of about 90 to the square mile compares with 275 for India, 285 for the former eighteen provinces of China, and over 500 for Japan.

This state of affairs, both past and present, taken in conjunction with the political fragmentation of South-East Asia which has been fostered by its physical division into a maze of islands and peninsulas, goes far to explain the extent to which it has fallen under the shadow of both India, China and, in more recent times, Japan. Thus, during the early centuries of the Christian era, nearly the whole of South-East Asia, apart from Annam which formed part of Imperial China, came under the influence of southern Indian colonization. This has left as its memorials not only the glories of Angkor and other monuments, but also the Buddhist religion of the mainland and the surviving Hinduism of Bali and Lombok. Likewise from India, through the intermediary of Gujarati spice traders, came Islam which, after the 13th century, established itself in the greater part of Malaysia but achieved no lasting foothold in the Buddhist lands farther north.

In the meantime, however, commercial ties had been slowly developing between many parts of South-East Asia and the Chinese empire. At least from the 8th century A.D. onwards there are records of missions arriving in

[p. 12(C)]

● 101 China from Java and elsewhere in the Nan Yang ('southern seas'), bringing with them specimens of their countries' produce. Although these were apparently intended to promote trading relationships between the lesser lands of South-East Asia and the great empire to the north—a design in which they were usually successful—the Chinese frequently chose to interpret such missions as evidence of submission and to regard the goods brought by the foreigners as tribute. Thus there grew up an established tributary relationship between many countries of South-East Asia and Imperial China. By an extension of the Confucian family code into foreign affairs the former lands came to be styled the younger brothers and China the elder brother and, notwithstanding the severance of these links by the European powers in modern times, this attitude is by no means forgotten even today.

Despite these very ancient links of both its great neighbours with South-East Asia, however, it was not until the area had begun to pass under European control that really extensive Chinese or Indian settlement took place within its borders. To be more precise, although the Dutch found many Chinese, as also a handful of Japanese, in Indonesia even in the early 17th century, it was not until the latter half of the 19th century, when the completion of the Suez Canal led to rapid economic development in South-East Asia, that Chinese began to pour into almost every part of the region. Meanwhile, and more especially in the present century, Indians, though on a smaller scale, have emigrated to those areas, notably Burma and Malaya, which were under British influence or control. Taken as a whole, this migration, which has provided South-East Asia with a population of over eight million Chinese and nearly two million Indians at the present day, must be regarded as second only to the great European exodus to the Americas during the same period. And, like it, the incentive was primarily economic. The relatively unoccupied pioneer lands in both cases provided far greater opportunities than the congested home-lands of the peoples in question. Just as the youth of Europe was advised to "go west," so to the Southern Chinese and Indians opportunity beckoned towards the south and east respectively.

The resultant plural societies, which are a feature of every country in South-East Asia, form yet another distinctive characteristic which marks out the latter as something different from either of its great neighbours. Yet the parcelling out of the region, with the solitary exception of Thailand, into a series of western-controlled dependencies, each subjected to different methods of administration in accordance with the particular colonial philosophy of the respective metropolitan power, served steadily to obscure the overall unity of South-East Asia as a whole. Indeed, it was not until the Japanese overran the entire region after 1941, thereby depriving the West of invaluable supplies of rubber, tin, and both vegetable and mineral oils, and creating a vast series of problems, many of which still defy solution, that the West first began to think in terms of South-East Asia as an entity.

[p. 13(A)]

●101 The primary problem at this juncture was, of course, to expel the Japanese from the area, and it was with this in mind that SEAC, which first publicised the new regional name, was established. Of necessity SEAC had initially to be based outside the region, since the latter lay entirely in enemy hands. Unfortunately, the habit has consequently grown up of regarding Ceylon and often, by association, both India and Pakistan as well, as integral parts of South-East Asia, and this has undoubtedly led to much confusion and muddled thinking. More recently, several writers have attempted to perpetuate this use of the term on the grounds that, under the aegis of the Colombo Plan, a new economic alignment is developing between South and South-East Asia. Thus, for example, Mr. Woodrow Wyatt* has stated that the formerly accepted definition of South-East Asia in its narrow sense is out of date since it is impossible to dissociate the countries to which it refers from India, Pakistan and Ceylon. While one may in large measure agree with many of his conclusions, this particular argument would appear to lead logically to such absurdities as including the United States in a definition of Western Europe or the Soviet Union as part of Eastern Germany.

The usage should, however, be criticised for more fundamental reasons than this. In the first place the problems of South Asia are by no means the same as those of South-East Asia. Thus, whereas in South Asia the outstanding problem is posed by over-population, only a few parts of South-East Asia are so affected and the region as a whole could undoubtedly support many more people without fundamental changes in techniques. Indeed, although its immediate preoccupation is with economic and political rehabilitation after the disruption and devastation of Japanese rule, which South Asia did not experience, South-East Asia may well in the near future come to regard the existence of so much relatively sparsely peopled land as its greatest source of weakness. Already since 1945 the Japanese have again several times raised the matter of emigration to such under-developed lands as eastern Indonesia and, with mounting population pressure in India, Pakistan and China also, it is by no means impossible that Japan's lead may later be followed by others of South-East Asia's neighbours.

This, in turn, leads to a further criticism of the extended use of the terms South-East Asia to embrace South Asia as well. Granted that the ties between India, Pakistan and Ceylon on the one hand and South-East Asia on the other are both strong and of deep historical significance, it still remains an open question whether they will prove tougher and more permanent than those which bind the latter to East Asia.

In the days before the war, when the modern concept of South-East Asia had not won general acceptance, two alternative names for the area were sometimes used, *viz.* Further India and the Far Eastern Tropics. Both of these terms enshrine important elements of truth, and both implicitly suggest that South-East Asia, on account of its

* *Southwards from China*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1952.

[p.13(B)]

● 101 inherent weakness, must be thought of in relation to one or other of its Asian neighbours.

Such is clearly the case today. The ties binding South-East Asia to India (and to a lesser extent to Pakistan) are based largely on personal respect for India's leaders and a common experience of breaking free from political dependence on the West. In this respect India is, in effect, the elder brother to the newly-independent States of South-East Asia and has effectively championed their cause both at the United Nations and elsewhere. Thus India has taken over the rôle which was formerly, though hardly disinterestedly, played by Japan as champion of "Asia for the Asiatics"* until the experiences of 1942-5 revealed her true intentions.

Certainly today there is far less affection in South East Asia for Japan than for India, but, thanks to the rapacity of many Chinese middlemen, local feeling towards China is even more hostile throughout the region. Thus, on grounds of sentiment alone, the alignment of South-East with South Asia appears to be eminently secure.

Unfortunately, however, this is by no means the whole story and two other factors weigh heavily on the opposite side of the balance. Economically speaking, the interdependence of temperate and tropical lands, at least in the present stage of Asian development, affords a firmer basis for trade between South-East and East Asia than anything existing in the relationship between the former

* The term "Asians" had not then come into general use.

[p 14(A)]

•101 and India. This interdependence, which has in some degree underlain the economic geography of the Far East from the days of the early tribute-bearing missions to the time of Japan's short-lived Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere, is likely to be exploited still further in future. Certainly, so long as Japan is cut off from trade with China she has no option but to pursue such a course, and it is by no means unlikely that China herself, once industrialized, will follow a similar policy. And, if such should indeed prove to be the case, the presence of a vast Chinese commercial community scattered throughout South-East Asia would be a formidable asset, quite apart from its even greater potential significance should an attempt ever be made to create by force a new Co-prosperity Sphere under Chinese auspices.

In short, the conclusion seems inescapable that the alignment between South and South-East Asia, desirable though it undoubtedly is from the standpoint of all free men, is by no means assured for the years that lie ahead. On the contrary, the possibility of new association with East Asia, with all the formidable consequences which that implies, cannot be ruled out. Indeed the dominant theme in the oriental history of the second half of the 20th century may well be the struggle of both South and East Asia for paramount influence in the area which lies between them. Greater East Asia we have known in our lifetime; it remains to be seen whether Greater South Asia can capture the minds and energies of men sufficiently to prevent a further relapse into barbarism and exploitation.

[p. 14(B)]

15:Adams E-4 (no date)1948 ALl Southeast Asia ALl

RICE CULTIVATION IN ASIA

By INEZ ADAMS

243 THE terminology employed by writers discussing Asiatic rice agriculture has raised a problem: are the cultivated varieties of rice distinctly separable into one group that will grow under none but irrigated conditions, and another that demands moderate amounts of moisture but is successfully produced only by dry farming? The terms used in the literature frequently bear this implication. They include references to "wet" and "dry," "dryland," "lowland," "upland" and "mountain" rice. In anthropological studies whose purpose is merely descriptive this creates confusion. When extended to comparative studies and historical reconstructions, with the two methods of cultivation treated as distinct for the conclusions reached, it becomes necessary to examine the distinctions that might justify such use.

101 171 243 184 As early as 1820, John Crawfurd, writing his "History of the Indian Archipelago," observed that rice is known as "padi . . . in all languages and dialects from Madagascar to the Philippines."[1] He distinguished in Java a "marsh" rice, sown in nurseries and transplanted to flooded fields, and a "mountain" or "dryland" rice, grown on arable uplands. These terms remain current. Lowie defines them thus:

243 The innumerable variations of the plant fall broadly into two categories, with corresponding techniques of husbandry. "Swamp" rice can be grown only in marshes or under irrigation. "Mountain" rice yields smaller crops, but can be grown anywhere with normal precipitation.[2]

Wilhelm Wagner[3] speaks in a similar sense of "den gewöhnliche Wasserreis" and "den sogenanten Bergreis," in his account of Chinese agriculture. C. Daryll Forde makes the same general differentiation of cultivated rices falling[4] into two groups due to the physical requirements of the plant. Wissler[5] mentions "The cultivated varieties known as 'hill,' 'upland,' or 'dryland' rice," in contradistinction to the "aquatic varieties." Keesing,[6] in one work on the Philippines, employs "wet" and "dry" rice; elsewhere[7] he speaks of "dry agriculture" in Indonesia, as distinguished from the practice of terracing with irrigation.

E. M. Loeb,[8] in his general ethnography of Sumatra, notes rice raised in both flooded and dry fields by the Bataks; in the Minangkabau, . . . "wet and dry rice fields are worked together by the men and women . . . ";[9] in Nias, . . . "both the wet and dry variety are grown . . . ";[10] in Atjeh, "Rice is of both the wet and dry variety. The wet rice fields, when not laid in swamps, are irrigated

[1] Crawfurd, 1820, Vol. I, p. 358. [2] Lowie, 1938, p. 294. [3] Wagner, 1926.
[4] Forde, 1934. [5] Wissler, 1946. [6] Keesing, 1937. [7] *Idem.*, 1934.
[8] Loeb, 1935. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 101. [10] *Ibid.*, p. 132.